

STUDIES IN SIXTEENTH CENTURY ENGLISH
LITERATURE OF RUSTIC LIFE

By
HAROLD PEYTON WHEELER

A.B., Wofford College, 1928
A.M., Duke University, 1929

AN ABSTRACT OF A THESIS
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN
ENGLISH IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, 1938

URBANA, ILLINOIS
1938

STUDIES IN SIXTEENTH CENTURY ENGLISH
LITERATURE OF RUSTIC LIFE

By
HAROLD PEYTON WHEELER

A.B., Wofford College, 1928
A.M., Duke University, 1929

AN ABSTRACT OF A THESIS
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN
ENGLISH IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, 1938

URBANA, ILLINOIS
1938

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This study was in great part made possible through interlibrary loans. For their cooperation I am grateful to the United States Library of Congress and associated libraries, the New York Public Library, the Newberry Library, the John Crerar Library, and the Libraries of Harvard University, the University of Chicago, the University of Michigan, *et al.* I am indebted to Miss Belle da Costa Greene, librarian of the Pierpont Morgan Library, for a full description of a work unavailable for my study. To the staffs of the Newberry Library, the John Crerar Library, and the Library of the University of Illinois I wish to express my appreciation for many courtesies; and of the staff of the Library of the University of Illinois I wish to thank particularly Miss Fanny Dunlap, reference librarian, for her untiring efforts over a period of eighteen months to secure books through the interlibrary loan, and Professor P. L. Windsor, director of the library, who enabled me to use on micro-films much material which would have been otherwise unavailable. To Professor H. S. V. Jones I am first and finally grateful—for having suggested an interesting subject which gives promise of being fruitful as well, for his kindly criticism and helpful advice, and for patience.



STUDIES IN SIXTEENTH CENTURY ENGLISH LITERATURE OF RUSTIC LIFE

A study of the literature of rustic life in sixteenth century England reveals two distinct trends. First, marked with definite characteristics, there is a group of native English works based on experience. While the earliest examples of this group were written before the Renaissance was full blown, the later works were definitely affected by the Renaissance. The other trend, which was not altogether conducive to improvement in arable farming or in cattle raising, and the influence of which persisted far past the end of the century, was a direct result of the revival of learning. Awakened to and intoxicated by the literature of the ancients, one school of thought placed a premium on antiquity. The belief became prevalent that everything worth knowing had already been discovered, and that everything worth saying had already been well said. All that was necessary was to make the classics available to English readers, for them to find whatever information was wanting. Accordingly, public spirited citizens went willingly to their appointed tasks to reveal to their countrymen the hidden wonders of foreign tongues. The tendency characteristic of the Renaissance to translate from foreign languages, to compile, and to adapt is perhaps as marked in rustic literature as in any other field, and it was responsible for such comprehensive works as Hill's compilations on gardening (1563 and later), Blundeville's four books on horses and horsemanship (1565-6), Googe's translation of Heresbach's husbandry (1577), Mascall's compilation on the ordering of cattle (1587), Surfflet's translation of *La Maison Rustique* (1600), and, in the early seventeenth century, the voluminous compilations of Gervase Markham. Less extensive works illustrative of the same tendency are the early translations and compilations on planting and grafting trees; Mascall's later translation on the same subject (1572); the anonymous *The Orchard, and the Garden* . . . (1594); R. E.'s translation on poultry (1572); Mascall's compilation on the same subject (1581); the anonymous *Remedies for diseases in Horses* (1576); Bedingfield's adaptation of Corte and Astley's adaptation of Xenophon and Grisone, both

treatises, on riding, of the same year (1584); and Churchey's translations of Dubravius on fish ponds and fish (1599). The larger treatises, and the smaller ones as far as their limited subjects allow them to do, fall generally into the classical tradition of rustic literature.

For even in rustic matters there was a classical tradition, which was gradually established through succeeding centuries from the time of Hesiod, whose *Works and Days* (c. 776 B. C.) Pliny considered the earliest positively known work that contained directions for cultivating the ground.

Hesiod's *Works and Days*, however, is not a systematic agricultural treatise, and in many respects it resembles independent English works, especially in its insistence that one apply himself willingly to his work, live frugally, be content with his lot, and seek no gain wrongfully, and in its assurance that justice will be done. However, Hesiod worked into the poem directions for farming operations, and he concluded with superstitious warnings and with an enumeration of lucky and unlucky days, features which are frequently though not regularly included in works in the classical tradition, but which became indispensable parts of the almanacs and prognostications that multiplied during the sixteenth century. Later writers frequently mentioned Hesiod with respect as an agricultural authority, but the influence of the *Works and Days* upon succeeding rustic literature—except upon Virgil's *Georgics*, for which it is said to have been the model—was not pronounced.

Xenophon (c.454-c.355 B. C.) contributed much to the classical tradition. Three phases of his *Oeconomicus*—on the praise and antiquity of rustic life, on the duties of the housewife, and on the selection and training of a bailiff—became stock features in rustic literature, and all three are usually present in comprehensive agricultural works until after the end of the sixteenth century. Xenophon's influence persisted both directly and indirectly. Cato no doubt used his *Oeconomicus*, and Varro and Columella drew heavily from it, Columella using the Latin translation made by Cicero. Through these works and through others, such as that of Tasso translated into English in 1588 by T. K. as

The Housholders Philosophie . . ., the *Oeconomicus* was indirectly reflected. Xenophon's influence in sixteenth century England is a subject that deserves individual and thorough consideration, for it extended far beyond the scope of rustic literature considered even in its broadest sense. But in rustic literature that influence was pronounced. Besides its indirect reflections already mentioned, the *Oeconomicus* was still used directly, for the English translation made in 1532 by Gentian Hervet proved quite popular, six or more editions being issued before 1573. After the time of Varro, horses and horsemanship were included in the scope of rustic matters, and Xenophon's *De Re Equestri* proved comparably influential. It was consistently quoted or referred to as authoritative in sixteenth century treatises on horses and horsemanship, and the fact that Christopher Clifford, who was illiterate, mentioned Xenophon, is evidence that the latter's opinions were frequently discussed among horsemen. Astley's *The Art of Riding . . .* (1584) is chiefly an explanation of the rules of Xenophon and Grisone which the author had applied with success. It is not improbable that Xenophon's contribution to the literature of another phase of country life was influential. Late in the thirteenth century the scope of rustic literature was broadened to include the sports hunting, hawking, and fishing, and it may be that the *Cynegeticus* of Xenophon influenced early English works on hunting. Jacques du Fouilloux spoke of him respectfully as an authority on the subject.

The *De Agricultura* of Marcus Porcius Cato (234-149 B. C.), the first Latin contribution to the genre, is significant in that rustic literature was extended to embrace home medicine and secrets appropriate to various agricultural operations, and to include a calendar of work. Cato ascribed marvelous medicinal qualities to the cabbage, the panacea for all ills, and other writers attributed medicinal properties to practically all herbs. It is in this union of medicine and agriculture that the herbals, an independent type popular throughout the sixteenth century, become rustic literature. Comprehensive works from the time of Columella contain sections which are miniature herbals in them-

selves, and these must have had a considerable appeal to the middle class families, since one duty of the wife was to keep her household in health. In the sixteenth century Conrad Heresbach deplored the practice of importing foreign drugs, adding that every poor man has the right remedies growing in his garden, and that if men would make their gardens their physicians, the physicians' "craft" would soon decay. It was the affinity of medicine and husbandry which led Liebault, a French physician, to enlarge his father-in-law's compilation on rustic matters to the encyclopaedic volume of the later *Maison Rustique*; and this work was translated into English, 1600, by Richard Surfleet, also a physician. But besides giving early evidence of the affinity of medicine and husbandry, the *De Agricultura* is significant. Cato included recipes for cooking, pickling, preserving, preparing medicines, etc., such as from the time of Columella were regularly included in the section on the duties of the housewife. He also gave secrets appropriate to various agricultural operations, as for preserving grain from vermin, causing barren trees to bear, making laxative wines, etc. These secrets and those of subsequent writers are characterized by superstition—in the magical significance given to numbers, the marvelous properties attributed to herbs and stones, and the potency ascribed to charms and incantations. Such secrets, likewise, from the time of Columella, became an established part of the agricultural tradition. In Leonard Mascall's *A Book of the Arte and Manner how to Plant and Graffe . . .* (1572) may be detected a vestige of the pagan ritual modified by Christianity. Secrets were so highly regarded that, extended to all the arts and trades, they became an independent type of literature, the various books of secrets popular throughout the sixteenth century having thus their connection with rustic literature. Finally, following Hesiod and Xenophon, who had urged that all work be done at its appropriate time, Cato included a calendar of work, which, while not strictly chronological, no doubt marked the beginning of a tradition. Cato's *De Agricultura* was decidedly influential upon the works of Varro, Pliny, and Columella; besides the indirect influence reflected through these, the direct was active in the six-

teenth century on the compilation of Conrad Heresbach.

The *Rerum Rusticarum Libri Tres* (c.36 B. C.) of Marcus Terentius Varro was intended to cover all branches of agriculture and to exclude all extraneous matter, such as the medicines, recipes, and secrets included by Cato. In addition to the situation and arrangement of the estate, Varro recognized in agriculture three divisions. The first, on agriculture proper, included arable farming, gardens, and orchards. The second embraced the breeding, raising, and training of all cattle, including dogs and shepherds. The third included various kinds of poultry and birds; all animals kept in enclosures, from animals kept in parks to be hunted, to bees; and fish kept in ponds. To each of his three branches Varro extended the traditional praise of the worthiness and antiquity of agriculture. His work, principally drawn from his predecessors, is in dialogue form, an authority on each subject explaining the approved practices of the time. The influence of Varro on rustic literature cannot be overestimated, for he became and for long remained the standard authority on agriculture. He was the principal source from which Virgil drew material for his *Georgics*, and Columella, Pliny, and Crescenzi all drew heavily from him. Although the scope of agriculture as he defined it was further broadened in the rustic tradition, his influence was still active as late as the sixteenth century, when Heresbach followed his form and method and included much of his substance.

The *Georgics* of Publius Virgilius Maro (70-19 B. C.) were probably written with a purpose similar to that of Hesiod's *Works and Days*, to popularize rustic life rather than to serve as a practical guide to husbandry. Nevertheless, the poem is significant, for in the *Georgics* is the complete union of agriculture and astronomy, which was suggested in Hesiod, Cato, and Varro. Virgil stated that the knowledge of astronomy is as useful to the husbandman as to the sailor, for it guides him in his work. From the state of the moon he can determine the lucky and unlucky days for each operation. If he fears the destruction of his crops by winds and storms, he should study the heavens and learn to interpret the signs. Succeeding writers continued

to stress the value of astronomy in agriculture. Throughout the sixteenth century in England the knowledge of astronomy was spread through translations and compilations in the agricultural tradition, through almanacs and prognostications, and through separate works on astronomy, in which were usually given directions for the husbandman. The influence of the *Georgics* is a subject for individual study. Virgil early gained the reputation of an agricultural authority, perhaps through the work of his disciple Columella, who wrote one of his books in verse in professed imitation of the *Georgics*, and who quoted from them frequently. That influence was active upon the compilation of Conrad Heresbach (1508-1576), whose quotations from Virgil are comparable in number to those of Columella. And no doubt many almanacs in sixteenth century English are indebted to the *Georgics* for tokens of fair weather, signs of rain, and other prognostications.

The *De Re Rustica* . . . of Lucius Junius Moderatus Columella (1st century A. D.), besides establishing Virgil as an agricultural authority, broadened the scope of rustic affairs to include all of Varro's divisions as well as the recipes, secrets, and medicines which Varro had rejected. Columella's work, in twelve books with an added book on trees, is, consequently, the most comprehensive up to its time, and it gained immediate and lasting attention. It was the principal source of Palladius, and Book X in imitation of Virgil may have inspired Palladius to write in verse his fourteenth book, on trees. The direct influence of Columella persisted until the sixteenth century, when his *De Re Rustica* . . . served as a favorite source for compilers and adapters of rustic literature.

The *De Re Rustica* of Palladius Rutilius Taurus Aemilianus (4th century A. D.) is interesting chiefly for its form, Books II-XIII being divided according to the months. It is, then, an elaborate calendar of work with the various phases of agriculture discussed each at its appropriate time. Perhaps the subject most fully developed is that of planting and grafting trees, and this part seems to have influenced separate English works on the subject until the end of the sixteenth century. Of the clas-

sical writers discussed, Palladius was perhaps most influential on the England of the middle ages, for his *De Re Rustica* is the only comprehensive agricultural work known to have been translated into English before the Renaissance. The fifteenth century translation in Chaucerian stanzas (published by the *Early English Text Society*) may have suggested the form of Tusser's "A hundreth good pointes of husbandrie," (1557), later expanded into *Five Hundred Pointes of Good Husbandrie* (1573). Both are in verse; both are arranged in the form of a calendar; and there are some similarities in expression. All in all, Tusser's work bears a closer resemblance to that of Palladius than either to Hesiod's *Works and Days*, or to Varro's *Rerum Rusticarum Libri Tres*, with both of which it has been compared.

The earliest Italian work on agriculture, that of Pietro Crescenzi (1230-1307), although principally drawn from its predecessors, is significant in the tradition in that the scope of rustic literature was again broadened. Varro had included beasts of the chase in his farmyard stock, and dogs among his cattle; and Crescenzi felt it necessary for completeness to include the sports of hunting, hawking, and fishing. His work served as a model for the comprehensive *Maison Rustique* (1564), which also included them. And this latter may have influenced Gervase Markham in the seventeenth century to issue his encyclopaedic *A Way to get Wealth . . .*, composed principally of his own earlier published compilations.

From the preceding can be inferred, besides the general influence of individual contributors, most of the characteristics of the classical rustic tradition. Works in the tradition and drawn from it generally include a praise of rural life, in which the antiquity and profitableness of agriculture are stressed. But this characteristic underwent a change. From the time of Varro, the praise, first generally given, was extended specifically to the various branches of agriculture, so that the compilation of Dubravius on fish ponds, translated into English by George Churchey (1599), must necessarily include a discourse upon the worthiness, the antiquity, and the profit of raising fish. Moreover, the characteristic underwent another change. Xenophon

and Varro maintained that agriculture is not only the worthiest of arts but also the most ancient. Succeeding writers seem to have injected a causative force and to have concluded that it is the worthiest of arts *because* it is the most ancient. This idea was in harmony with the emphasis placed on antiquity during the Renaissance, and compilers sought to surpass their sources in upholding agriculture as the worthiest of arts—Heresbach even included the testimony of Jesus Christ. Characteristic of the comprehensive works in the tradition are a section on selecting and training the bailiff; a section on the duties of the housewife, in which are generally included recipes for cooking, for preserving, and for preparing medicines; a section giving the medicinal qualities and the uses of herbs in simples and compounds; and a calendar of the year's work. Another characteristic usually found is the enormous number of superstitious secrets and practices affecting the various operations of farm life; in these superstitions, classical as opposed to popular, can be detected the magical power attached to numbers, the marvelous properties ascribed to herbs and stones, and the significance given to charms and rituals. The tendency of works in the tradition to become encyclopaedic, I have pointed out. The range early included household management and the cultivation of fields, gardens, and orchards; it was extended to include the raising of cattle and all other animals kept for sport, use, or profit. It embraced medicine, astronomy, and natural science, and finally was extended to include sports. Together with the above characteristics is the tendency to methodize, to systematize—which is illustrated generally by a more or less standardized organization of material which successive writers felt impelled to follow, and specifically by classifying according to excellence, as the classifying of manure according to goodness and the valuing of animals, as horses, according to color and shape. These characteristics are not all to be found in every work in the classical tradition; but some are to be found in all, and all, in several.

The renaissance translators, compilers, and adapters in the rustic tradition were seldom themselves experienced in the mat-

ters of which they wrote. Crescenzi was a lawyer; Heresbach, a theologian; Liebault, a physician who wrote on agriculture because of its affinity with medicine; Surfleet, a physician. Blundeville and Hill were scholars who compiled works on a variety of subjects. Googe was better known as scholar and poet than as husbandman. Mascall may have lived on a country estate, but from his lack of discrimination in *The First Booke of Cattell* . . . (1587), one must conclude that his experience with cattle was limited. Markham was experienced with horses, but even on this subject he drew from the classics, and his practical experience in husbandry, upon which he wrote much, must have been small. According to Columella, the diligent husbandman should seek out the writings of the ancients, accepting only the practical, and should consult the wisest husbandmen of his time. The compilers generally had no criterion as to practicality—in an age of new found wonders, the superstitious secrets for obtaining marvelous results no doubt had their appeal. However, generally, they obeyed the precept to consult the wisest husbandmen of their time. Heresbach included in his compilation the results of his own observation, and Googe enlarged his translation of Heresbach (1577) to include his own experience and that of his countrymen. Blundeville sought out the advice of experts and made his own contributions based on reason, rather than on experience. Mascall interfused with material drawn from the ancients the practical advice of Englishmen. Markham combined his own experience on horses with what he had gleaned from other writers, and Astley wrote of his own experience in applying the precepts drawn from tradition. In fact, Astley's *Art of Riding* . . . (1584), though based on the works of Xenophon and Grisone, is quite practical and shows marked characteristics neither of the classical rustic tradition nor of independent English works.

Quite different procedures were followed by the compilers of sixteenth century rustic literature. The earlier compilers, Blundeville, Hill, and Heresbach, were impelled by a scholarly interest in their work. They organized their material carefully, and they were painstaking in giving its sources. However, the

sanctity of authorship was not always recognized even in higher types of literature, and writings on rustic matters came to be regarded as common property, especially in the later Elizabethan period. To later compilers, all was fish that came to the net; and Mascall, Markham, and the compilers of *La Maison Rustique* took large sections from their predecessors, seldom indicating their indebtedness. Mascall frequently included from his actual sources, which he did not acknowledge, references to works he had not himself seen. Markham in his *Maister-peece* . . . (1610) included almost all of Blundeville's fourth book without even mentioning Blundeville's name. Since these later writers compiled without clear reference to their sources, there is frequently no indication of where a passage from one source leaves off and where another begins. An *I* in the works of Mascall and Markham, and in *La Maison Rustique*, may refer to the writer or to any one of his authorities. While Markham's works generally are well organized, the arrangement was not always, as I have shown, his own. Except for unity in each of its books, Mascall's *Government of Cattell* . . . is decidedly lacking in organization, the position of a section being determined by its source rather than by any plan. In these later works it is not always possible to determine what, if anything, the compiler himself contributed. And there is evidence that not only compilers but also printers considered rustic literature as common property. For the section which is Chapter 22 of Markham's *Farewell to Husbandry* . . . (1620) was appended to the edition of 1627, and subsequent editions, of Mascall's *Government of Cattell* . . . , so that in histories of agriculture Mascall is said to have introduced improvements in arable farming, on which subject he did not write.

Because of the manner in which the compilations were made, there is often a marked similarity in style, chiefly because the compilers and adapters were translating or paraphrasing from the same sources. Passages translated by Mascall from Columella are often similar to passages in Googe's translation of Heresbach, where the later paraphrased Columella. And passages in *La Maison Rustique* drawn from Columella are similar in phraseology to these.

The general conclusion may be drawn that the works in the classical rustic tradition, from the very inclusiveness of subject matter, were intended for the owners of large estates or for their bailiffs. An exception may be made of Hesiod's *Works and Days* and Virgil's *Georgics*, but these, as I have shown, were not principally intended to set forth a system of agriculture. It is true that Palladius criticized his forerunners for writing in such an elegant style that they could not be understood by husbandmen; yet it is clear that his own work was not intended for the tenant farmer. Such compilations as Hill's works on gardening (1563 and later) and Googe's *Four Books of Husbandry* . . . (1577) must have been eagerly purchased by wealthy townsmen who were coming into possession of country estates, and who, no doubt, directed their farming from garden arbors.

The independent English rustic literature may be said to have begun before the sixteenth century, for Walter of Henley's *Husbandry* (13th century) exhibits some of its traits. The first representative in the century was John Fitzherbert's *Boke of Husbandry* (1523), which illustrates the type well. To be noted is the practicality of its content, for it was written not from books but from forty years of experience. Fitzherbert emphasized the fact that he who works not should not eat, but he recognized the different estates of man. Each estate had its fixed duties, and the yeomen and tenant farmers, for whom the book was expressly written, had been ordained to till the soil. In his *Surveying* (1523), written for land owners and for the nobility, Fitzherbert considered the duties of the higher estate. Man has two duties to God. He should give himself to God spiritually, and he should live below, in whatever his station, as God would have him live—he should be frugal and thrifty, friendly with his neighbors, and charitable to the poor. Charity is even profitable, for God will more than repay whatever one bestows in alms. Fitzherbert refuted certain superstitious beliefs held by his countrymen, maintaining that the content of his work was wholly the fruit of experience. There is little evidence for the assertion that Fitzherbert was indebted to Walter of Henley. *The Boke of Husbandry*, though its comprehensiveness may have been suggested

by the scope of works in the classical tradition, seems a wholly independent production. Whereas the earliest Italian, French, and German works on husbandry were largely compilations, Fitzherbert's *Boke of Hvsbandry*, the earliest English treatise on the subject, was based on experience; and it proved influential. Large portions of it were inserted in Mascall's compilation with scant acknowledgement, and Markham used it without admitting his indebtedness in any way. Googe, however, gave Fitzherbert due credit for the material he borrowed.

Tusser's *Fiue Hundred Pointes of Good Husbandrie* (1573) also is professedly based on experience, and it is, consequently, comparatively free from superstition and superstitious customs. Too, it was written not for the owners of large estates, but for the individual actively engaged in cultivating the soil. The element of piety is again pronounced. As in Fitzherbert's work, man should live as God would have him live. He should be friendly toward his neighbors and charitable toward the poor. It is profitable to live the right kind of life, for the godly man shall best speed.

Reynolde Scot's *A Perfite Platforme of a Hoppe Garden* . . . (1574) is also a practical work. Scot recognized the different estates of man; and in his treatise, written expressly for husbandmen, he included illustrative diagrams for the better instruction of the illiterate. He referred to the ancients only to contrast their opinions with his own experience. He displayed a certain degree of piety, and in his deprecation of the fraud used in selling hops is his insistence upon honest dealings between man and man.

The Schoole of Horsmanship . . . (1585) of Christopher Clifford, himself illiterate, was based solely on experience. In this, too, the element of piety is pronounced, and experimentation rather than books is urged as the way to knowledge. Through his own experience Clifford disproved certain superstitious beliefs held by his contemporaries.

Edmund Southerne's *A Treatise Concerning the right vse and ordering of Bees* . . . (1593) is based on the author's own experience. Southerne maintained that none before him in England

had written on bees from experience, and his treatise seems pointed at Hill's compilation on the same subject, appended to later editions of *The Arte of Gardening* . . . From his experience Southerne exposed fallacies in the traditional instruction both as to the propagation of bees and the manner of keeping them. The element of piety is evident in Southerne's urging farmers to pay truly the tithes on profits from bees, even though in most places bees were not considered tithable.

John Taverner's *Certaine Experiments Concerning Fish and Fruite* . . . (1600), inspired by Churchey's 1599 translation of Dubravius on fish ponds, in the classical tradition, is based on experience. Taverner through sound observation corrected a number of the latter's views, as well as certain other erroneous beliefs of his own countrymen. He showed charity toward the poor, making a distinction between those poor folk who pilfered from orchards only to stave off hunger and those who carried off great quantities of fruit.

The works of Hugh Platt, *Diuerse new sorts of Soyle* . . . (1594) and *The newv and admirable Arte of setting of Corne* . . . (1600), based on his own experience and that of his contemporaries, are both practical treatises for the enlightenment of husbandmen. Insisting on experimentation as the way to knowledge, Platt was the first Englishman to accept the findings of Palissy and to urge further investigation along the same line. His outlook was scientific, and he rejected superstitions, retaining only what had been proved. While he was charitable to the extent of wanting the poor provided for, he felt that the able-bodied should work for their living; and since they would have to be fed anyway, he urged that farmers use them in experimental projects, in which much might be gained, and nothing lost.

Richard Gardner's *Profitable Instrvctions for the Manvring, Sowing and Planting of Kitchin Gardens* . . . (1599) was written from the author's own experience expressly for the benefit of the poor. In many respects it is as sound as a present-day treatise on the subject. The element of piety throughout is as marked as in Fitzherbert and Tusser, Gardner urging his readers to "Loue God aboue all things and thy neighbor as thyself."

Each should consider himself God's steward and use his wealth as God would have him do. From experience, Gardner showed a better method of gardening than those customary or traditional.

From the works considered above, the characteristics of independent English treatises of rustic literature can be determined. Some of these are evident in Hesiod's *Works and Days* and in Virgil's *Georgics*, which poems insist on work, thrift, and honest dealings between man and man; and many are to be found in the sermons of such contemporary ministers, moralists, and social reformers as Bishop Latimer and Robert Crowley. The first is the emphasis upon work. He who works not should not eat. Each individual has certain duties, and he should perform them willingly, being content with his lot. Next is a strong element of piety. One should give himself to God spiritually and should consider himself as God's steward here on earth, living and using his wealth as God would have him do. Consequently, he should live frugally, be neighborly, and show charity to the poor. For charity is even profitable, as God will repay all that is given in His name. In these works, based on experience, superstitious secrets and practices for the most part were rejected. However, some vestiges of superstition, probably popular rather than classical, remained. Tusser believed in the properties of the winds, and most writers felt the moon to be influential on certain operations. This fact is not surprising, however, as at the present time many people believe in the efficacy of the moon. What is surprising is that Richard Gardner and Hugh Platt had the audacity to question Luna's power. Particularly in the works of Christopher Clifford, Edmund Southerne, John Taverner, Hugh Platt, and Richard Gardner appear the results of experimentation. And Hugh Platt urged that every husbandman experiment in order to determine the best procedure; he was a worthy forerunner of the scientific revival which was to take place in the following century. Finally, the works based on experience, as opposed to those in the classical tradition, were written not for the owner of estates, nor for his bailiff, but for the husbandman, the tiller of the soil.

Again, not all the independent English works reveal all these

characteristics; but all exhibit some of them; and some, all. Many of the writers betray a knowledge of the classics of agriculture, as occasional sentences sometimes indicate. Moreover, some of the independent English works have classical characteristics as well. For example, Fitzherbert's *Husbandry* has the trait of being comprehensive, and Tusser's work takes the form of the traditional calendar. Yet for the most part, the references to classical authors, as in Southerne, Scot, and Platt, serve merely to contrast classical opinions with the writer's own experience.

Although Blundeville in his compilation addressed two of his books to gentlemen, since the common sort could not read or would not understand, and although Scot included many illustrative diagrams for the better instruction of those who could not read, the present opinion is that literacy among the middle classes in sixteenth century England has been considerably underestimated. The works based on experience, written for husbandmen, are for the most part clearly and lucidly expressed. Except for the preface, epilogue, and occasional passages in Scot's *A Perfite Platforme of a Hoppe Garden . . .*, which illustrate the artificial mechanical expression to come in vogue, and for an occasional passage in the works of Hugh Platt, who became eloquent in sarcasm, the writers gave little or no attention to the artificialities of style.

All the works in the rustic tradition in sixteenth century England, both those translated or compiled and those based on experience, were professedly, and no doubt genuinely, motivated by a patriotic zeal. Each writer or compiler was moved to do his bit for the benefit of the commonwealth, as the prefaces and epistles to the reader assert. In the treatises on horsemanship, proficiency in which was urged for defense of the realm, patriotism runs high. It reached its peak, however, after the defeat of the Armada, and subsequent rustic literature reflects the new national consciousness of the English people. Edmund Southerne conceded the superiority of no honey to that of England. John Taverner held translation from foreign tongues to be unsuitable instruction for Englishmen; his was an English book for English people. Richard Gardner urged the widespread culti-

vation of carrots, which would sustain people in cities in case of a siege. Hugh Platt in speaking of a worthy ancient work, the authorship of which he did not know, wished it had been fronted with the title and name of an Englishman. And elsewhere, he quoted from Virgil in the original and from Baptista Porta to contrast their opinions unfavorably with his own and with those of Barnaby Googe: "And thus you haue Rome and Naples answered with Surrey & London, I praie God al maie bring forth one good conclusion for our common-wealth of England." (*The nevv and admirable Arte of setting of Corne . . .*, 1601, C³rev.)

The present study shows that in sixteenth century English literature of rustic life, as in other types of literature, there was a group of works drawn from classical literary sources and marked with the characteristics of tradition, and also another group of works, with equally distinctive traits, independent of that tradition and based on experience. Some works, however, do not fall easily into either classification, as Bedingfield's *The Art of Riding . . .* (1584), adapted from Corte; Astley's *The Art of Riding . . .* (1584), in which the author wrote his experience in applying the rules of the ancients; and Gervase Markham's *How to chuse, ride, traine, and diet both Hunting-horses and running Horses . . .* (1595), which is partly traditional, but at least two books of which are based on experience. Of the other works which I have discussed, some which are predominantly in the classical tradition contain material based on practical experience, since the compilers consulted contemporary practitioners. Other predominantly independent treatises, as Tusser's work, display characteristics of the classical tradition.

Also, as might be expected, the study reveals the cycles of history and the foibles of human nature, ever the same. Varro and Columella deplored that gentlemen were forsaking rustic life for pleasures of the city, and that broad fields which had been under cultivation were being turned into pasture land. The conditions of which they complained could not have been less real in sixteenth century England, when ministers, moralists, satirists, and social reformers all lamented the decline of tradi-

tional hospitality and the abuses resulting from widespread enclosures for sheep. Varro and Columella also condemned the prodigality of their countrymen—who because of their love of finery arrayed themselves far above their means, and who constructed their villas not for utility but for display. While these charges are doubtless perennial, the frequency with which they were made in sixteenth century England—in agricultural works, sermons, satires, and complaints—would rival that in any other country at any other time.

I have been interested in the influence of Virgil's *Georgics* upon sixteenth century treatises of rustic life, and I find that, excluding almanacs, which I have not studied systematically, that influence was, for the most part, indirect. Virgil is referred to in Blundeville's *The fower chiefest offices* . . . , but these references Blundeville took from Grisone. He is occasionally referred to in Hill's treatise on bees, appended to later editions of *The Arte of Gardening* . . . , but these references were taken from an intermediary source, probably Columella. He is occasionally referred to in T. K.'s *Housholder's Philosophie* . . . (1588), but this was translated from Tasso. He is referred to in George Churchey's *A New Booke Of good Husbandry* . . . , but this was translated from Dubravius. He is occasionally referred to in *La Maison Rustique*, but Surflet translated this work from the French. In only two English works of the period are the *Georgics* frequently quoted—in Googe's *Four Bookes of Husbandrie* . . . and in Mascall's *The Government of Cattell*. Googe's husbandry is a translation into English of the compilation of Conrad Heresbach, who gleaned the quotations. When Gervase Markham in his *Compleat Jockey* . . . , appended to later editions of the *Master-piece* . . . (1723 ed., p. 50), quoted Virgil's description of the horse, he went not to Virgil, but inserted, without acknowledgment of his own source, the passage in Heresbach's compilation which Googe had turned into English. And in Mascall's compilation *The Government of Cattell*, every single quotation from Virgil, as I have shown, was taken in its setting from Columella. In three independent English treatises on rustic life, Virgil is mentioned. Reynolde Scot named him, among

others, in citing the ancients, to whose opinions he contrasted his own experience. Edmund Southerne mentioned him as representative of the ancients, whose directions gave no more than they imagined by natural reason, as Southerne's own fourteen years of experience had proved. And Hugh Platt quoted Virgil in the original to contrast him unfavorably with an Englishman. It is noteworthy that the first translation of the *Georgics* into English, that of A. Fleming, 1589, was made not in the interest of agriculture, but "to do some good for Grammar Schooles."

I have pointed out that the supposed excerpts from Leonard Mascall's translation of *La Maison Rustique*, published in W. A. Woodward's *The Countryman's Jewel* . . . , London, 1934, are actually excerpts from the translation made by Richard Surflet, and that these were taken from either the 1600 or the 1606 edition of Surflet's translation, before it was revised and augmented by Gervase Markham. Mr. Woodward reproduced Surflet's translation (1606 ed.) to the letter—punctuation, capitalization, and orthography—even to marginal notes. His only departures from Surflet's original text were to omit from passages he included, words or phrases which in the original applied to France or which contained words which to the twentieth century reader might seem indelicate. I have found no indication that Mascall ever made or proposed making a translation of the passages ascribed to him by Mr. Woodward from Surflet's text.

The present study is completed. It remains for further investigation to determine what influence the rustic literature of the period had upon higher types. My study reveals the difference between the milkmaid in technical works, who had to account for all the produce under her charge and who could allow no one to enter the dairy, and the milkmaid as portrayed in literature. It reveals the difference between the shepherd in technical works, who was not allowed even to sit while in charge of his flocks, and the shepherd of the pastoral, who lazily reclined in the shade of a tree or by the banks of a rippling stream. Perhaps the real milkmaid and shepherd were to be found somewhere between these extremes. In *The Diary of Master William Silence* . . . , London, 1897, the Honorable D. H. Madden has

shown the application of the literature of sport to the higher forms of literature, and it is not improbable that the literature of rustic life in general, which in its broad sense includes sport, may have a similar application. Certain it is that Shakspeare, Spenser, Lyly, Sidney, and numerous others portrayed country life. The *Arcadia* contains many delineations of horsemanship, and Sidney, to whom Clifford's work was dedicated, was doubtless familiar with the current treatises. In portraying country life, authors unfamiliar with the subject may have consulted the rustic literature for information, as some are known to have consulted the literature of sport. The marvelous properties of herbs and stones mentioned in the Euphuistic writings of the period could have been found in the rustic literature of the classical tradition, and perhaps all that is attributed to Pliny did not come directly from him. However, it is too early to speak of the relation of rustic literature to other genres. Future studies may well begin with this relationship.

VITA

Harold Peyton Wheeler was born April 11, 1905, at Campobello, South Carolina, where he received his early education. After a four-year intermission, during which time he served an enlistment in the United States Army, he was graduated from the Campobello High School in 1925. His college and university training is as follows: Wofford College, A.B., 1928; Duke University, A.M., 1929; University of Illinois, 1931-8.

He served as assistant in physics at Wofford College, 1927-8, and as assistant in English at Duke University, 1928-9. From 1929 to 1931 he was instructor in English at Kemper Military School. Since 1931 he has been employed continuously as full-time assistant in the English Department of the University of Illinois.

